

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action of December 23, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 9, 11, 13, and 15 have been amended.

Claims 9, 11, 13, and 15 have been amended to clarify that the specification requirements are obtained from a demander through a client computer and that information is outputted to the client computer and to correct antecedence for elements in the claims. No new matter is added by this amendment.

The demander, though a client computer, is the one selects the material and the processing. The demander simply does not accept what is available from a supplier. In the prior art, a demander of a commodity would make a request and the supplier, or others in the supply chain, would supply the product in accordance with their own materials and processing. Other than selecting the desired product, the demander would have no input on the materials and processing.

Claims 9, 11, 13 and 15 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,953,707).

The system disclosed by Huang is generally used for forecasting future demand based on sales history data collected by means of "POS" or the like, thereby allowing the user to make a plan for controlling production, sales, and inventory. In Huang, the system user does not include the "demander" who purchases and uses end products. Rather, Huang describes the system user as a plant manager or sales manager who is a decision maker (see the summary of the invention.) There appears to be no opportunity for the demander of the commodity to input data on desired material or processing, which affects the quality (finish) of the end products. That is, the customer selects from available options whereas in the system of instant claims, a customer inputs desired material and processing and the system finds the options available.

In contrast to the position asserted on page 3 of the Office Action, it appears that the "line item ID" shown in Appendix A, page 223, is for placing an order of a product, not for defining material etc. used in making the end product. That is, other than selecting the desired product, the demander has no input on the materials and processing to make the product.

Appln. No.: 09/846,358  
Amendment dated March 15, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2004

Huang does not teach each element of the instant claims as required by the instant claims. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claims 10, 12, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. and further in view of the "Earth-friendly good" article.

Huang does not teach or suggest the invention for the reasons discussed above. The "Earth-friendly good" article does not remedy the defects of Huang. Although the article describes using thinned-out wood to make, for example, furniture, the article does not describe any system to allow information on desired wood material, desired production place, and desired processing from an end user to be matched with wood available from thinned-out woods, production places, and available processing.

The article is unrelated to the system of Huang and there is simply no reason one skilled in the art would have substituted thinned-out wood for the products described in Huang. However, even if the raw material of Huang was thinned out wood, neither teaches or suggests a system based on the demander's need. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: 3/14/05

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan A. Wolffe  
Registration No. 33,568

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001